



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,191	01/26/2004	Masahito Nasu	1466.1083	6426
21171 7590 11/12/2009 STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				
EXAMINER				
LO, SUZANNE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2128				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/12/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/763,191

**Applicant(s)**

NASU, MASAHI TO

**Examiner**

SUZANNE LO

**Art Unit**

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 6 and 7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 6 and 7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 have been presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, it is unclear what is meant by “to the part group when said grouping is *performed*”. Examiner interprets the above limitation as where said grouping is performed.

In claim 6, it is unclear what is meant by “for *ach* of the plurality of parts”. Examiner interprets the above limitation as for each.

All claims not specifically treated are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-2 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Unigraphics Solutions™ (“User’s Guide Getting Started with SOLID EDGE™ Ver. 8.0”).

As per claim 1, Unigraphics is directed to a partial reprojection method for reflecting for use in a three-dimensional CAD system, the method comprising: generating a two-dimensional projection of *a three-dimensional assembly model formed by a plurality of parts* by projecting the three-dimensional assembly model formed of *the plurality of parts* (page 258 Drawing Production, “You can create associative drawings..”, page 207); grouping two-dimensional elements *together* in the two-dimensional projection for each of the plurality of parts to form a part group for each of the plurality of parts (page 274, Documenting Multiple Parts in One Draft Document and page 150, “Maintaining Relationships” and “How Relationships Work”); adding, part information to the part group when said grouping is preformed, the part information including a line of sight, and a part position for each of the plurality of parts (page 296 Annotations and Associativity and page 269 Setting Projection Angle for line of sight, page 280 “When you change parts and assemblies in part views, you can easily update the views so they match the new model geometry.”, page 278-279 Drawing views for Parts in Assemblies on pages 231 and 258, page 186); leaving the three-dimensional assembly model unloaded and loading, as a target for a partial reprojection, a modified three-dimensional part model of a part of which a shape has been modified among the plurality of parts (page 280, Part View Updates); deciding a projecting direction applicable to the modified there-dimensional part model based on the line of sight included in the part information of the part whose modified three-dimensional part model is to be subjected to the partial reprojection (page 280, Part View Updates, 2-D diagram drawing); deciding, in the two-dimensional projection of the assembly model, a generating position in which the two-dimensional elements of the modified three-dimensional part model are to be generated based on the part position included in the part information of the part whose modified three-dimensional part model is to be subjected to the partial reprojection (page 280, Part View Updates, 2-D diagram drawing); and performing, based on the projecting direction and the generating position thus decided, the partial reprojection of the modified three-dimensional part model and generating a modified version of the two-

*dimensional projection of the assembly model by reflecting the shape that has been changed (page 280, Part View Updates, page 207).*

As per claim 2, Unigraphics is directed to the partial reprojection method according to claim 1, further comprising: deciding which should be performed, an entire reprojection based on the assembly model or *the* partial reprojection based on the modified three-dimensional part model (page 282 Setting Retrieval Options, pages 258 Drawing view, page 232 Update options), wherein: if the partial reprojection is decided to be performed, only the shape *that has been changed is reflected in the modified version*, and the part information *is unchanged*; (page 282-283 Dimension Retrieval).

As per claims 6-7, Unigraphics is directed to a computer-readable medium storing a program for a three-dimensional CAD system that enables reflection of a shape modified in a part model on a two-dimensional projection generated from an assembly model, the program causing a computer perform the method steps of claims 1-2 and are therefore rejected under the same prior art.

#### **Response to Arguments**

4. Applicant's arguments filed 07/02/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. The previous 35 U.S.C. 112 rejection has been withdrawn due to the amended claims. However, the amendments have created new 112 issues.
6. In response to Applicant's argument i) that Unigraphics does not disclose the two-dimensional projection having part information based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model for each of the plurality of parts, the Applicant is directed to page 207.

In response to Applicant's argument ii) that the cited pages of Unigraphics are irrelevant to grouping two-dimensional elements together...for each of the plurality of parts, the Applicant is directed to the Specification of the instant application page 11, line 8, "elements".

In response to Applicant's argument iii) that Unigraphics does not disclose adding the part information based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model to the part group when said grouping is performed, the part information including a part name, a line of sight, and a part position for each of the plurality of parts, the Applicant is directed to page 186.

In response to Applicant's statement iv) that Unigraphics does not show or depict how the change in part views is reflected in the original three-dimensional assembly model, the Examiner notes that by doing so, Unigraphics teaches "leaving the three-dimensional (original) assembly model unloaded".

Applicant's arguments v) and vi) fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references and Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. Additionally, Applicant is directed to page 207 in regards to a coordinate system.

In response to Applicant's argument vii) that Unigraphics does not disclose "performing, based on the projecting direction and the generating position...." Based on a coordinate system of the three-dimensional assembly model, the Applicant is further directed to page 207.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing

date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. The prior art made of record is not relied upon because it is cumulative to the applied rejection.

These references include:

1. U.S. Patent No. 5,649,076 issued to Nishizaka et al. on 07/15/97.
2. U.S. Patent No. 7,016,749 B2 issued to Kuzumaki et al. on 03/21/06.
3. U.S. Patent No. 7,039,469 B1 issued to Haws et al. on 05/02/06.
4. U.S. Patent Application Publication US2003/0071810 A1 published by Shoov et al. on

04/17/03.

5. U.S. Patent No. 6,611,725 B1 issued to Harrison et al. on 08/26/03.

8. All Claims are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Suzanne Lo whose telephone number is (571)272-5876. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah can be reached on (571)272-2297. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair->

Art Unit: 2128

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kamini S Shah/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
2128

/SL/  
11/05/09